



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—THE TROJAN WAR AGAIN.

To those who accept the *Iliad*, substantially as we have it, for the work of a single poet the duration of the war which forms its background will not seem a matter of merely incidental interest. For if we may assume that Homer means to tell the story of what happened a few weeks after the Achaians landed, as Professor van Leeuwen maintains,¹ a good many things which on the traditional view require explanation and apology immediately become reasonable and convincing. Professor Scott has written an interesting paper setting forth his reasons for declining to make this assumption, but that he feels, as indeed everybody must, that it would make the *Iliad* more human and intelligible is shown by the following words from his closing paragraph:

“Many events, such as the muster of the troops, the report of Iris-Polites as to the multitude of the Greeks, the duel between Paris and Menelaus, the *Teichoskopia*, and the advice of Nestor in regard to military tactics, do not belong strictly to the tenth year of a siege, but the poet must give us some impression of the appearance of the army, of the tactics to be employed, of the regal bearing of Agamemnon, of the beauty of Helen and her mental attitude regarding her present and former husband, and also the contrast between Paris and Menelaus, but since he did not describe the earlier years of the war he must insert them in the only part he did describe”.²

This is tantamount to an admission that the *Iliad* would have been a more perfect poem—because less artificial in its motivation—had the poet not been hampered by a tradition which forced him to lay his scene in the last year of a long war. But before we grant the existence in Homer's day of

¹ *Mnemosyne* 38 (1910), pp. 354 sqq. = *Commentationes Homericae*, Leyden, 1911, pp. 1 sqq. This article is a revision (with considerable modifications) of one which appeared in *Mnemosyne* 34 (1906), pp. 193 sqq.

² On the Assumed Duration of the War in the *Iliad*, *Class. Phil.* 8 (1913), pp. 445 sqq.

this long-war tradition, and make such excuses as we can for the inappropriateness of these episodes in such a setting, we should consider if there be not other things in the *Iliad* which also point to a short war, things which cannot be explained as forced upon the poet by an embarrassing tradition.

Take Achilles. If Homer's sources obliged him to think of Achilles as having been in camp before Troy for nine years at the moment when the action of the *Iliad* begins, it is clear that they cannot also have compelled him to make Achilles out a youth of eighteen or twenty; yet that is exactly what he has done. Homer nowhere tells us the age of his hero, but not to see that he is portraying a noble and impulsive *youth* would mean the failure to appreciate a character-delineation which is perhaps the greatest achievement of the Greek epic.¹

The evidence afforded by the poet's treatment of Helen is, of course, less extensive, and maybe less definite, but there are not wanting signs that Homer thinks of her as very young. Her hot resentment against her abductor, her keen desire that Menelaus may be victorious, her almost overwhelming sense of shame in the false position she occupies in Troy—these emotions are too poignant by half to be natural in a woman who has lived ten (or must we say even twenty?) years as the wife of Paris and a princess among the Trojans.

A very definite indication of the brevity of the war is seen, however, in certain words spoken by Hermes in Ω. The god has come to meet Priam and guide him safely to the hut of Achilles. "He went", says the poet (vss. 347 sqq.), "in the likeness of a young prince, with the first down upon his cheeks", and when Priam asked who he was and of what parents, Hermes answered "I am one of the Myrmidons, and my father is Polyktor". This shows clearly that to the writer of these verses the war had not been going on nine years, for Hermes tells us that the son of Polyktor had left his home to follow Achilles to the Troad, and at the close of the action of the *Iliad* he is still so young that the down is just appearing on his cheeks. The indirect and off-hand way in which this

¹ This portrait of the youthful Achilles owes its vividness, in large measure, to a considerable number of little touches. There is a *résumé* in van Leeuwen's *Comm. Hom.*, pp. 24-26 = *Mnem. Tom. Cit.* pp. 375-377, with citation of the passages.

valuable hint is conveyed makes it the more convincing. The poet quite evidently does not expect us to be surprised that a soldier who has been with Achilles from the beginning should be scarcely more than a boy as the war draws to a conclusion. Professor Scott thinks that Homer had no intention of giving Hermes the form and attributes of the son of Polyktor, but was merely describing the god as tradition represented him. "When once an actor is given or supposed to have a definite form or age", says Mr. Scott, "he maintains each unchanged throughout", and he rather sternly taxes Professor van Leeuwen with "an utter failure to grasp" this principle, which he terms "one of the fundamental laws of Homeric poetry". But as we read on, we learn that this "law" is derived from a consideration of certain passages in the *Odyssey*, and to those (of whom Professor van Leeuwen is one) who believe that the *Odyssey* is the work of a later poet than the author of the *Iliad* there will seem little justification for employing it to determine the interpretation of a passage in the older poem. Though for that matter the "law" in question does not seem to be applicable, in either poem, to the appearances of gods to men.¹ Iris in B 795 assumes the figure of Polites, and in Γ 121 that of Laodike. Athene comes to Telemachos in the guise of Mentes in α 105, and to Nausikaa in that of the daughter of Dymas in ζ 22. Obviously a god can assume any form he chooses, for the nonce, and I see no reason to doubt that the youthful look of Hermes here is merely the look of the young Myrmidon. Professor Scott calls attention to the fact that "Hermes appeared to Priam in exactly the same form as he appeared to Odysseus in κ 279". But it would be a little hazardous to conclude from these two epiphanies (especially since the verse is obviously borrowed in one of these passages from the other one) that extreme youthfulness was an Homeric attribute of Hermes. Dr. Leaf remarks in his note on Ω 348 that "it is strange that the description should suit only the youthful Hermes of the

¹ Professor Scott also brings his law to bear upon Mr. van Leeuwen's arguments from the youthfulness of Helen. Here his citations showing the Odyssean conception of Helen as in the prime of her youth would certainly afford some countenance to his interpretation of Homer's treatment of her in the *Iliad*,—if one accepted the common authorship.

great age of Greek art; for in works of the archaic period the god is always represented as bearded". Strange perhaps in the *Odyssey* passage, where no disguise seems intended, but not in Ω , where the god is pretending to be a certain man and naturally counterfeits that man's appearance of youth.

Again, that the war is still young is the most natural inference to be drawn from the mention of so many Trojan allies as newly arrived in the Troad. This evidence Professor Scott seeks to explain away by the assumption that Troy did not summon her allies till the war had been going on nine years,¹ i. e. until the Achaians, seeing that Troy could not be taken by storm, determined to cut off her supplies and executed the raid which Dr. Leaf calls the Great Foray. This coup compelled the Trojans to fight, and accordingly they summoned all their allies, and relinquishing their former policy of passive resistance, took the field in force and attacked the Achaians, who were now, in their turn, put upon the defensive and hastily constructed the trench and wall. The allies were not called in earlier because (1) numbers were not necessary to defend the strong fortifications, and (2) they would have consumed food needed by the regular garrison, and so have shortened the period of successful resistance. The real cause for the change in the Trojan plan of campaign, namely the success of their enemies in cutting off their supplies, was ignored by Homer, who substituted for it the motif of the Wrath, which he introduced at the moment when economic causes had obliged the Trojans to assume the offensive.

This ingenious attempt to explain the tardy arrival of many of the allies as a reflection of the actual course of events in a historical ten years' war sets up a hypothesis involving serious difficulties. It seems most unlikely that the invaders would devote nine years to ineffectual attacks upon the city, before hitting upon the obviously sensible plan of maiming Troy's dependencies,² and striking at her sources of supply. Again, it is hardly probable that Priam would have endured the risks and hardships of a war at his very gates, for nine years,

¹ Professor Scott says "several years", but as he goes on to refer to the Great Foray as occasioning the change of plan, the preliminary stage of the war will have lasted nine years.

² Cf. Leaf's *Troy: a Study in Homeric Geography*, p. 316 sqq.

without calling upon his allies for help. There never was a *siege*, in the proper sense of the word, and the Achaeans never attempted an actual investment of the city. The Foray was doubtless intended to cripple the resistance of the Trojans by the seizure of treasure, cattle, and other means of prolonging the struggle; but no systematic attempt seems to have been made to prevent the allies from coming and going freely, either before or after the Foray, nor can Priam have had any occasion to fear that he might be unable to import supplies for them. Moreover Troy subsisted chiefly, if we accept Dr. Leaf's conclusions as to her *raison d'être*, which I understand Professor Scott to do, upon the tolls she was able to exact from the concourse of traders who gathered annually in the Trojan Plain for the great Fair over which King Priam presided. It seems therefore more than doubtful that she would have tamely suffered the interruption of this fair for nine summers without mustering all her resources in an effort to dislodge the interlopers. Finally, it is unreasonable to suppose that Troy's influence with these allies of hers—an influence based on commercial considerations—could have been so closely maintained during nine years of commercial sterility that at the close of this period she could still command their services in her defence.¹ It appears then much more likely, on *a priori* grounds that Professor van Leeuwen's long list of allies who have recently arrived is best accounted for by the explanation which he himself offers, namely that Priam issued his appeal for help on first learning of the prospect of invasion, and that while some of the forces arrived before the enemy, others, like the remote Paionians, only turned up when the summer was already half over.²

¹ This would apply especially to the Lykians, whose carrying trade between the South and the Troad was the life-blood of their national prosperity. See Dr. Leaf's *Troy*, pp. 320-322.

² Dr. Leaf says (*Troy*, pp. 318 sqq.): "Troy, though it cannot be taken, is being slowly bled to death by the exhaustion of its economic resources. Though the entry of troops and food cannot be hindered, it is at least possible to make it a place to which no trader will come, and so to exhaust the accumulated wealth which has sprung from its favoured position in the past. This is the picture which is put before us throughout, most clearly in the words of Hector (xviii. 287-92): 'Have ye not had your fill already of being pent behind the towers?

Another indication that Homer's sources told of a short war is to be found in the fact that the dozen mostly casual references to captives and booty taken from captured cities of the Troad all point to a single expedition, when Achilles, shortly before the action of the poem commences, raided Thebe, Lyrnessos, Pedasos, and probably Lesbos, and Tenedos. In a long war there would be many such raids, and the poem which has preserved twelve scattered references to this one would hardly have escaped some allusions to others.¹

It appears then, to sum up the case for a short war, that not

Of old time all mortal men would tell of the city of Priam for the much gold thereof, but now are its treasures perished out of its dwellings, and much goods are sold away to Phrygia and pleasant Maionia, since mighty Zeus dealt evilly with us'. Hector's argument is, 'you have tried the policy of sitting still within your walls, where you are safe; and the result is that you are being worn down by loss of wealth. The only safety that we can find now is in the offensive'.

"Achilles too speaks of the impoverishment of the rich city (ix. 401) : 'For not of like worth with life hold I even all the wealth that men say was possessed of the well-peopled city of Ilios in the days of peace gone by, before the sons of the Achaians came'. Of the burden of subsidies to the allies we hear in xvii. 225 : 'For this end am I (Hector) wearying my people by taking gifts from them and nursing thereby the courage of each one of you'. The picture vividly describes the plight of a city whose wealth is founded on commerce only; which depends upon an army sufficient for police purposes in times of peace, but inadequate to meet a foreign invader. Its only resource in the emergency is to hire mercenaries from outside; and where should they be sought but among the nations who had a vested interest in the maintenance of existing trade against an aggressive and growing people who sought to control commerce to their own advantage"?

It will be noticed that Dr. Leaf conceives of Troy's loss of wealth as chiefly due to the expense of maintaining a mercenary army. Professor Scott, who also cites these passages, does not expressly attribute the depletion of Troy's resources to this cause, perhaps feeling that since his hypothesis involves only one season's employment of mercenaries he must account for it rather by the need of buying supplies for the regular garrison for a period of several years. To my mind, the financial embarrassment which is here hinted at might conceivably have come very swiftly to a community such as Troy seems to have been, when it found itself obliged to subsidize a large army of foreign troops. The verses cited contain therefore no answer, that I can find, to the question whether the war was a matter of years or of months.

¹ I have presented the evidence for this argument in A. J. P. XXXV (1914), pp. 294 sqq.

only are there many important passages in the *Iliad* which are more natural and intelligible upon this view of the matter, but that there are also certain unequivocal proofs that this was the form of the legend known to Homer (I refer particularly to the many passages implying the extreme youth of Achilles, and to the Hermes passage). The numerous references to newly-arrived allies are best explained in this way. And finally there is the argument *ex silentio* to which I have just called attention.

Why then has it been universally supposed that the ten-year tradition was followed by Homer?

First, because there are four passages in our *Iliad* where this is as good as stated; second, because there are several other places where it seems to be implied; third, because the older, short-war, tradition had been supplanted by the later, ten-year, form of the story, as early as the date of the composition of the *Odyssey*, since the chronology of the later poem is evidently based on the assumption that Odysseus had been ten years in the Troad.

From the time of the *Odyssey*, the short-war tradition is no more heard of, and there would be no evidence that it had ever existed, were it not for the traces of it to which Professor van Leeuwen has directed our attention in the *Iliad* itself.

Two questions are at once suggested. How came the legend to be so radically modified during the period which lay between the composition of the *Iliad* and that of the *Odyssey*? And how came the older poem to admit interpolations inconsistent with its own form of the story?

Professor van Leeuwen has not failed to realize how necessary it is for him to answer these questions in a satisfactory manner, if he hopes to find acceptance for his theory. His explanation may be summed up as follows:

In the old stories which celebrated the Trojan War were preserved vague traditions of various expeditions made by Greeks to the coast of Asia Minor. Some of these traditions had formed a part of the legend, from the beginning; others were subsequently incorporated with it. The cycle of stories which the earliest Achaian settlers had carried with them to Asia Minor assimilated, from time to time, the names of a

good many ancient heroes who had come over to those coasts, at one time or another, from various parts of Greece. With the lapse of years a considerable number of these stories came to be connected by fictitious genealogical ties, and along with the increasing compass of the events thus associated there came a gradual lengthening of the period within which they might reasonably be presumed to have occurred—the poets being solicitous lest the heroes of their songs appear contemporary with their own fathers, or even their grandfathers.¹

The Greeks did not readily distinguish between earlier and later, in dealing with their epic poetry, and as they read the Iliad they inevitably confused with its ideas notions which had grown familiar to them from the works of later poets. Odysseus had been absent from his home twenty years: ergo the Trojan War had lasted ten years. Menelaos had required several years to get his fleet together: thus Helen was in her twentieth year at Troy when she mourned over Hektor. Troy had been taken by Neoptolemos, begotten by Achilles, before the war, in Skyros: hence the preparations for the war and its prosecution must have lasted long enough for Neoptolemos to grow up. It was at the marriage of Peleus and Thetis that Eris set the goddesses to quarreling, and their rivalry shortly led to the rape of Helen, when Achilles was not yet born: therefore Troy was captured by Neoptolemos about forty years after Paris won Helen for his wife. In this way the years were multiplied, to correspond with the increasing mass of stories which had come to be connected with one another, and it is lucky that the late poet who put these words in the mouth of Helen,

ἤδη γὰρ νῦν μοι τόδ' ἑικοστὸν ἔτος ἐστίν,
ἐξ οὗ κείθεν ἔβην καὶ ἐμῆς ἀπελήλυθα πάτρης' (Ω 765 sq.)

should have made her only forty years old, and not sixty, for the latter age would be suggested, not indeed by common sense, but by a scrupulous reckoning of the years which had elapsed since the marriage of Peleus.²

¹ Mnemos. Tom. cit., p. 384 = Commentationes Homericae, p. 33 sq.

² Mnemosyne, Tom. cit., p. 374 = Commentationes Homericae, p. 23.

It would almost seem that Professor Scott must have overlooked these passages when writing his criticism of Professor van Leeuwen's theory. Otherwise he could hardly have penned the following sen-

Homer it is clear that the short war cannot have been the basis of his poem. But if one is prepared to admit that the retention of these verses may perhaps involve more improbable assumptions than their rejection, the next question will be what further indications the poem may contain that its author thought of a war of ten years. Such indications are in fact neither numerous nor positive. I give first those which Professor van Leeuwen has listed in the critical note to B 134 sq., in his new edition of the *Iliad*.

Γ 156 sq. The Trojan elders say, when Helen is seen approaching:

οὐ νέμεσις Τρῶας καὶ εὐκνήμιδας Ἀχαιοὺς
τοιγίδ' ἀμφὶ γυναικὶ πολλὸν χρόνον ἄλγεα πάσχειν·

I do not feel at all sure that we have here, in the phrase *πολλὸν χρόνον*, a reference to years of fighting. To the weary elders, pent within their walls, five or six weeks¹ may well have seemed "a long time".

Z 123 sqq. Diomedes to Glaukos:

τίς δὲ σὺ ἔσσι, φέριστε, καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων;
οὐ μὲν γάρ ποτ' ὤπωπα μάχῃ ἐνὶ κυδιαίρῃ
τὸ πρίν·

This seems to imply that there have already been battles between the Achaians and the Trojans.

Z 419 sq. Andromache speaks of the elms that grow about

in the face of the *Iliad*, did the later tradition arise? The very conception of changing the plan or details of a poem involves the existence of a group of men having the poem in absolute control" (p. 446 sq.).

It is obviously not the Leyden scholar but a man of straw who is here assailed, for Professor van Leeuwen assumes that the interpolations which point to a long war were the product of an age which knew not the tradition of a short war. The lines in question were not introduced into the poem because anybody wanted to "change the plan or details" of the *Iliad*. Indeed their introduction was only possible precisely because they did *not* involve any change in what people then assumed had always been believed about the Trojan War.

¹We are now, according to van Leeuwen's computation, in the twenty-third day of the action of the *Iliad*, and he estimates about fifteen days from the landing to the opening scene in A.

the grave of her father in a way which suggests that Eetion has been dead some years :

περὶ δὲ πτελέας ἐφύτευσαν
νύμφαι ὀρεστιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

But this passage is not a whit more inconsistent with the short-war hypothesis than with the traditional chronology of the poem. In either case Achilles slew Eetion in the Great Foray, and the Great Foray, with the capture of Chryseis, led immediately to the opening events of the poem.

Σ 434 sq. An allusion to Peleus as spent with age :

ὁ μὲν δὴ γήραϊ λυγρῶι
κεῖται ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἀρήμενος,

Professor van Leeuwen thinks that Homer regarded Peleus as a man in middle age. The connecting of the Trojan War story with the story about his marriage made an old man of him.

T 326-337, and Ω 466 sq. References to the son of Achilles :

ἦ ἐ τὸν δὲ Σκύρῳ μοι ἔνι τρέφεται φίλος υἱός,
εἴ που ἔτι ζῶει γε Νεοπτόλεμος θεοειδής.
πρὶν μὲν γάρ μοι θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἐόλπει
οἷον ἐμὲ φθίσεσθαι ἀπ' Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο
αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ, σὲ δέ τε Φθίῃνδε νέεσθαι,
ὥς ἂν μοι τὸν παῖδα θοῇ σὺν νηϊ μελαίνῃ
Σκυρόθεν ἐξαγάγοις καὶ οἱ δείξειας ἔκαστα,
κτῆσιν ἐμὴν δμῶάς τε καὶ ὑψερεφές μέγα δῶμα.
ἤδη γὰρ Πηλῆά γ' ὀλομαι ἢ κατὰ πάμπαν
τεθνάμεν, ἢ που τυτθὸν ἔτι ζῶοντ' ἀκάχησθαι
γῆραϊ τε στυγερῶι καὶ ἐμὴν ποτιδέγμενον αἰεὶ
λυγρὴν ἀγγελλίην, ὅτ' ἀποφθιμένοιο πύθεται.

τύνῃ δ' εἰσελθὼν λαβὲ γούνατα Πηλεΐωνος,
καὶ μιν ὑπὲρ πατρὸς καὶ μητέρος ἠυκόμοιο
λίσσσο καὶ τέκεος,

Professor Scott does not cite these passages in his own review of the evidence, though if genuine they are undoubtedly a strong argument for the traditional view. But they have long been suspected of being interpolations, "due to a desire to bring into the Iliad so prominent a hero of the later cycle" (Leaf, on T 327). It may be noted, in passing, that the author of the lines in T conceives of Neoptolemos as a child "too young to travel alone, much less to fight" (Leaf);—a notion hardly more compatible with the long war than with

the short one, for Homer shows that he thought of the war as destined to be ended soon after the death of Achilles,¹ and one who is now spoken of as a child will not be ready in a few weeks to replace the Achaian champion.² There is also in the second of these two passages a rather striking indication of interpolation, quoted by Dr. Leaf from Düntzer, to wit: "Priam does not follow the god's advice, as he makes no mention of either mother or son".

These are all the places in our text which seem to Professor van Leeuwen to be inconsistent with his theory. But Professor Scott cites a number of others which he regards as pointing to a long war, more or less clearly, and to these we must now turn our attention. I will frankly confess that I can discover no confirmation of the traditional view in any of them. It must be remembered that the new theory assumes that the Achaians have already been some two or three weeks in the Troad, when the Iliad begins.³ They have captured Thebe and other towns, and have taken much booty and many prisoners. Protesilaos was killed when the invaders landed. There has been some guerrilla fighting in the Trojan Plain. And, finally, the pestilence has carried off large numbers. These facts are sufficient to explain the following passages:

B 115. Agamemnon says:

ἐπεὶ πολὺν ὤλεσα λαόν.

B 161 sq.

*Ἀργείην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν
ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο, φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἵης.*

¹ Cf. van Leeuwen, *Mnem. Tom. cit.*, p. 371 = *Comm. Hom.*, p. 19.

² Dr. Leaf remarks that "such anachronisms are a small matter to a poet seeking for pathos", but an interpolator whose eye was on the detail he was seeking to embellish would be much more likely to disregard its relations to the whole scheme than the author of the poem would have been.

³ I do not know what Professor Scott means by speaking of "the theory of van Leeuwen that the first intimation that came to the Trojans of the landing of the Greeks is found in the speech of Iris who assumed the form of Polites (B 796 ff.)". Was the battle which attended the landing of the Achaians not yet known to the Trojans on this theory? Had they not yet had any hint of the Foray, in which their allies had suffered so heavily? Had Aineias not mentioned his little adventure on the crest of Ida? Did the Trojans know nothing of the pestilence which had been destroying their enemies a few miles away?

B 272 sq. The soldiers say to one another :

ὦ πόποι, ἣ δὴ μυρὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἐσθλὰ ἔοργε
βουλὰς τ' ἐξάρχων ἀγαθὰς πόλεμόν τε κορύσσων.

Γ 99 sq. Menelaos says to the Achaians :

ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέπασθε
εἵνεκ' ἐμῆς ἔριδος καὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔνεκ' ἀρχῆς.

Γ 125 sqq. Iris finds Helen at her web :

τὴν δ' εὖρ' ἐν μεγάρῳ ἣ δὲ μέγαν ἱστὸν ὕφαινε,
δίπλακα πορφυρέην, πολέας δ' ἐνέπασσεν ἀέθλους
Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων,
οὓς ἔθεν εἵνεκ' ἔπασχον ὑπ' Ἄρης παλαμάων.

Γ 130 sqq. Iris calls Helen to the wall :

δεῦρ' ἴθι, νύμφα φίλη, ἵνα θέσκελα ἔργα ἴδῃαι
Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων·
οἳ πρὶν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι φέρον πολύδακρυν Ἄρηα
ἐν πεδίῳ, ὀλοοῖο λιλαϊόμενοι πολέμοιο,
οἳ δὴ νῦν ἕαται σιγῇ. πόλεμος δὲ πέπανται.¹

E 788 sqq. Here (as Stentor) says :

ὄφρα μὲν ἐς πόλεμον πωλέσκετο δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,
οὐδέ ποτε Τρῶες πρὸ πυλῶν Δαρδανιάων
οἴχνεσκον· κείνου γὰρ ἐδείδισαν ὄβριμον ἔγχος·

H 113 sq. Agamemnon dissuades Menelaos from facing Hector by saying :

καὶ δ' Ἀχιλεὺς τούτῳ γε μάχῃ ἐνι κυδιανέρῃ
ἔρριγ' ἀντιβολῆσαι, ὃ περ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων.²

Besides the above passages, Professor Scott cites also :

I 351 sq. (Achilles speaks),

ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς δύναται σθένης Ἐκτορος ἀνδροφόνου
ἴσχειν·

¹ The context seems to require that *πρὶν* should here be taken in the sense of *modo*, not *antehac*, as Mr. Scott implies by quoting the passage as an argument for the long war.

² I include this passage with the rest of those which seem sufficiently accounted for by the fighting, etc., which has already taken place, even on the short-war hypothesis. But it seems altogether improbable that it reflects any traditional incident, at all. In I 352 Achilles boasts that so long as he was in the fighting Hektor never ventured far from the walls, and Dr. Leaf points out that this passage (also cited by Mr. Scott, among the indications of a long war) contradicts H 113, which he pronounces "a rhetorical exaggeration used at the moment for a special purpose".

"The fact that Achilles speaks of Hector", says Mr. Scott, "as the 'manslayer', exactly as he did in A 242, shows that this title or reputation must have been won in battles fought before the quarrel described in the first part of the Iliad". Does this mean that pre-Homeric accounts of the war must have told of earlier battles in which Hector had 'got his man', and that Homer, finding the epithet there applied to Hector, employed it in the places cited, in spite of the fact that he had himself left out the story of those earlier battles? If this were Mr. Scott's meaning one might suggest that it would seem a very natural and excusable thing in the poet, finding Hector anywhere thus described in earlier lays, to adopt the complimentary epithet in his own allusions to him, without being scrupulous to reserve it until Hector had actually done some man-slaying in the Iliad. But such is apparently not Professor Scott's meaning, for he has written a paper to show that "Hektor as he appears in Homer, is the creation of the poet who conceived the idea of the Iliad" (Class. Phil. 8 (1913) 160 sqq.). His argument must therefore be something like this: Homer imagined his creature Hektor to have been an experienced warrior at the time the Iliad begins; hence he must have thought of the Trojan War as having already lasted some years. But even assuming, with Mr. Scott, that the poet must have imagined the details of his Trojan hero's past, it does not follow that he conceived Hektor's man-slaying to have been done in this particular war, so that the epithet cannot be regarded as throwing any light on the problem under discussion.

Z 521 sq.

δαιμόνι', οὐκ ἄν τις τοι ἀνὴρ, δὲ ἐναΐσιμος εἶη,
ἔργον ἀτιμήσειε μάχης, ἐπεὶ ἄλκιμός ἐσσι·

Hektor thus addresses Paris, and Professor Scott comments: "If this is the first day's fighting of the war, Paris has had little opportunity to show his bravery". But in the paper just quoted he maintains that "Paris was the traditional leader and champion of the Trojans... Paris is no coward in Homer and no weakling, since his heroic proportions show through, despite the efforts of the poet to represent him as mean and timorous". Is not Z 521 perhaps one of the places where Paris's heroic reputation shows through? And might not

the want of sufficient justification in the Iliad for such a compliment, which Mr. Scott now explains as due to Homer's having omitted the earlier stages of the war, be ascribed to Homer's reluctance to accord Paris his traditional deeds of valour?—or, in Mr. Scott's words, to "the efforts of the poet to represent him as mean and timorous"?

B 13 sq. The Dream says:

οὐ γὰρ ἔτ' ἀμφὶς Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες
ἀθάνατοι φράζονται·

I can see here no "vague reference to a long war", as does Mr. Scott. Apollo has already shown his anti-Achaian sympathies, in the pestilence, and Zeus has already shown his friendship for Aineias, whom he has saved from capture in the Great Foray (Y 92 sq.). May not the Dream merely mean to imply that Apollo and Zeus are now ready to grant Here and Athena a free hand in assisting the Achaians?

B 344 sq. Nestor to Agamemnon:

Ἀτρεΐδην, σὺ δ' ἔθ', ὥς πρὶν, ἔχων ἀστεμφέα βουλήν
ἄρχεν' Ἀργείοισι κατὰ κρατερὰς ὕσμινας.

There is surely no need to see here an implication of previous battles, but only of previous steadfastness of purpose.

N 259 sqq. Idomeneus and Meriones boast of the many Trojan spoils they have taken. "As neither of these warriors", says Professor Scott, "has thus far more than fleshed his sword in the action of the Iliad, where did they capture all this armor, and in what battles did they perform their mighty exploits"? Surely there has now been ample time for these heroes to have slain many enemies. And why might not the poet take this method, as well as another, of letting us know that they have done so? Does Homer mean us to suppose that there have been no encounters in the battles he has described, save those which he has expressly mentioned?

Lastly, in Ω 257, Priam complains of the loss of three sons, Mestor, Troilos, and Hektor, but Hektor alone has had any share in the action of the poem. "Hence", says Mr. Scott, "the career of the other two must belong to earlier events". Why not to contemporaneous events which the poet found no room to chronicle? One would suppose that when Homer composed the Iliad there were current many κλέα ἀνδρῶν which

he worked up for his new poem, and many others which, for one reason or another, he did not see fit to use. That these rejected materials dealt with events prior to the action of the *Iliad* would be an unwarranted assumption. It is quite possible that the brave deeds of Meriones and Idomeneus, as well as the story of Mestor, and that of Troilos, were related in songs which were known to Homer, and that in the passages cited by Professor Scott these legends "show through",—to borrow his own significant phrase.

It cannot be denied that these lines, and many of the others in which Mr. Scott has seen an argument for the long war, are perfectly in harmony with that tradition. More than that, it may be granted that the reader who takes up the poem in the belief that it deals with the last year of a long war will readily and naturally discover references in these verses to events of earlier years. But if I have succeeded in showing that such an interpretation of them is never necessary, it follows that they cannot be accepted as evidence for the traditional view.

When Professor Scott and his fellow-believers in the common authorship of *Iliad* and *Odyssey* succeed in establishing the truth of their contention, Professor van Leeuwen's theory of the war will have to go the way of all flesh and most conjectures. But until that time comes it is to be hoped it may receive the consideration merited by an interpretation which so greatly enhances the beauty and verisimilitude of the *Iliad*.

B. O. FOSTER.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY.